

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

QUINTON COOK, )  
                        )  
Plaintiff,         )  
                        )  
v.                     )      CASE NO. 1:19-CV-314-WHA-CSC  
                        )      [WO]  
SHERIFF DONALD VALENZA, et al., )  
                        )  
Defendants.         )

**RECOMMENDATION OF THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

*Pro se* Plaintiff Quinton Cook filed this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action on May 2, 2019. Defendants have since filed an Answer, Written Report, and supporting evidentiary materials denying Plaintiff's allegations. Doc. 23. On September 5, 2019, the Court instructed Plaintiff to file a response to Defendants' materials by September 25, 2019. Doc. 24. The Court cautioned Plaintiff that his failure to file a response would result in a recommendation this case be dismissed for failure to prosecute. *Id.* To date, Plaintiff has not filed a response to Defendants' materials or otherwise complied with the Court's September 5, 2019, Order.

A federal district court has the inherent power to dismiss a case *sua sponte* for failure to prosecute or obey a court order. *See, e.g., Link v. Wabash R.R. Co.*, 370 U.S. 626, 629–30 (1962); FED. R. CIV. P. 41(b). The Eleventh Circuit has made clear that “dismissal is warranted only upon a ‘clear record of delay or willful contempt and a finding that lesser sanctions would not suffice.’” *Mingo v. Sugar Cane Growers Co-Op of Fla.*, 864 F.2d 101,

102 (11th Cir. 1989) (per curiam) (emphasis omitted) (quoting *Goforth v. Owens*, 766 F.2d 1533, 1535 (11th Cir. 1985)). Here, the undersigned finds that Plaintiff has willfully failed to file a response in compliance with the Court’s September 5, 2019, Order. And considering Plaintiff’s disregard for orders of this Court, the undersigned further finds sanctions lesser than dismissal would not suffice in this case.

Accordingly, the undersigned Magistrate Judge RECOMMENDS this case be DISMISSED without prejudice.

It is ORDERED that **by February 1, 2022**, the parties may file objections to the Recommendation. The parties must specifically identify the factual findings and legal conclusions in the Recommendation to which objection is made. Frivolous, conclusive or general objections will not be considered by the District Court. This Recommendation is not a final order and, therefore it is not appealable.

Failure to file written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) will bar a party from a de novo determination by the District Court of legal and factual issues covered in the Recommendation and waive the right of the party to challenge on appeal the District Court’s order based on unobjected-to factual and legal conclusions accepted or adopted by the District Court except upon grounds of plain error or manifest injustice. 11TH Cir. R. 3-1; *see Resolution Trust Co. v. Hallmark Builders, Inc.*, 996 F.2d 1144, 1149 (11th Cir. 1993); *Henley v. Johnson*, 885 F.2d 790, 794 (11th Cir. 1989).

Done, this 18th day of January 2022.

/s/ Charles S. Coody  
CHARLES S. COODY  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE